UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/789,779	02/27/2004	Peter J. Burke	708493.4036	9431
	7590 04/04/200 RINGTON & SUTCL:		EXAM	INER
IP PROSECUTION DEPARTMENT			PHASGE, ARUN S	
4 PARK PLAZ. SUITE 1600	A		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 1795	
IRVINE, CA 92	2614-2558			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/04/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Comments	10/789,779	BURKE	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Arun S. Phasge	1795	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timil apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	l. ely filed he mailing date of this communicatio 0 (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on			
	-· action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan		secution as to the merits i	is
closed in accordance with the practice under E.			
		0.0.2.0.	
Disposition of Claims			
 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 			
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the confidence of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121((d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No d in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/30/07, 2/4/05.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa	te	

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaler et al. (Kaler), US 2003/0048619.

The Kaler reference discloses the method and apparatus for the dielectrophoresis manipulation of a polarizable object as claimed (see claims 1-12).

The reference does not disclose that the electrodes are nanoelectrodes which are elongated. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the size and shape of the electrodes, because such modification to the size and shape has been well settled to be within the skill of the ordinary artisan.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Burke, article entitled, Nanodielectrophoresis: Electronic Nanotweezers.

The Burke article discloses the claimed method and apparatus as claimed (see the entire document). Although the author of the article might be one of the claimed inventors, the applicants are still another within the meaning of the U.S.C. 102.

Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hughes, article entitled, AC electrokinetics: applications for nanotechnology.

The Hughes article discloses the method and apparatus for the dielectrophoresis manipulation of a polarizable object as claimed (see claims 1-12). The reference further discloses that the electrodes are nanoelectrodes which are elongated (see figures 5 and 7 on pages 127, 128).

Therefore, the claims are anticipated.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arun S. Phasge whose telephone number is (571) 272-1345. The examiner can normally be reached on MONDAY-THURSDAY, 7:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nam X. Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-1342. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1795

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system,

contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you

would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to

the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or

571-272-1000.

/Arun S. Phasge/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1795

asp